

2015 INNOVATION FUNDSCALING GRANT RUBRIC

General Information		
Reviewer Name:		
Date Reviewed:		

	Total Points Possible	Points Received
1. Program Overview	25	
2. Need for the program	5	
3. Evidence of Success	20	
4. Partnership Overview	10	
5. Capacity to Scale	10	
6. Scope of Work	15	
7. Budget	15	
Total Points	100	

7 7	w udes a comprehensive description of the program it plans to scale, including the core components of the program model, the anticipated ogram will serve, and a comprehensive summary of the project goals, outcomes, and evaluation methods.	Score 25 points possible
20 21 22 23 24 25 (Excellent)	 The program overview includes and effectively describes all of the following components: An overview of the proposed Innovation Fund project, including: (a) a well-articulated explanation as to how the program aligns with the Innovation Fund priority area(s), (b) logical goals, written in a SMART format, (c) logical outcomes, and (d) a logical plan for collecting data and analyzing the program, A comprehensive overview of the core components of the program model, any changes the applicant intends to make to the model, and the rationale for those changes, and Excellent grammar and sentence mechanics (spelling, capitalization, punctuation). 	
14 15 16 17 18 19 (Good)	 The program overview describes the following or is missing one component: An overview of the proposed Innovation Fund project, including: (a) an explanation as to how the program aligns with the Innovation Fund priority area(s), (b) logical goals, written in a SMART format, (c) logical outcomes, and (d) a logical plan for collecting data and analyzing the program, An overview of the core components of the program model, any changes the applicant intends to make to the model, and the rationale for those changes, and Effective grammar and sentence mechanics (spelling, capitalization, punctuation). 	
8 9 10 11 12 13 (Average)	 The program overview is missing 2-3 components and/or vaguely summarizes the following: An overview of the proposed Innovation Fund project, including: (a) an explanation as to how the program aligns with the Innovation Fund priority area(s), (b) goals, somewhat written in a SMART format, (c) outcomes, and (d) a plan for collecting data and analyzing the program, An overview of the core components of the program model, any changes the applicant intends to make to the model, and the rationale for those changes, and Adequate grammar and sentence mechanics (spelling, capitalization, punctuation). 	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (Poor)	 Proposed Innovation Fund project plan proposal overview is missing more than three components and/or ineffectively summarizes the following: An overview of the proposed Innovation Fund project, including: (a) an explanation as to how the program aligns with the Innovation Fund priority area(s), (b) goals, not written in the SMART format, (c) outcomes, and (d) a plan for collecting and analyzing the program, An overview of the core components of the program model, any changes the applicant intends to make to the model, and the rationale for those changes, and Ineffective grammar and sentence mechanics (spelling, capitalization, punctuation). 	
0 (Incomplete)	If applicant has not completed the section, indicate the incompleteness with a zero.	
Comments:		

Need For Program The applicant include	des a documented need to scale this program and includes the quantifiable data used to determine this need.	Score 5 points possible
4 5 (Excellent)	 Applicant thoroughly explains how scaling this program will benefit students, teachers, or educational leaders. Applicant describes the data used to determine this need. There is a strong link between the data and the need. Excellent grammar and sentence mechanics (spelling, capitalization, punctuation). 	
3 (Good)	 Applicant explains how scaling this program will benefit students, teachers, or educational leaders. Applicant clearly describes the data used to determine this need. There is a link between the data and the need. Effective grammar and sentence mechanics (spelling, capitalization, punctuation). 	
2 (Average)	 Applicant vaguely explains how the grant will benefit students, teachers, or educational leaders. Applicant imprecisely describes the data used to determine this need, or indicates that there are not many data available. There is a weak link between the data and the need. Adequate grammar and sentence mechanics (spelling, capitalization, punctuation). 	
1 (Poor)	 Applicant does not explain or minimally explains how scaling this program will benefit students, teachers, or educational leaders. Applicant does not describe the data used to determine this need, or there is a nonexistent link between the data and the need. Ineffective grammar and sentence mechanics (spelling, capitalization, punctuation). 	
0 (Incomplete)	If applicant has not completed the section, indicate the incompleteness with a zero.	
Comments:		

• •	s ibes how the existing program has generated positive student achievement or teacher and leader effectiveness outcomes, and that, when will yield similar results.	Score 20 points possible
16 17 18 19 20 (Excellent)	 Applicant thoroughly explains the existing data regarding student achievement and/or teacher and leader effectiveness over time. There are qualitative and quantitative data showing causation between the program and the outcomes. Excellent grammar and sentence mechanics (spelling, capitalization, punctuation). 	
11 12 13 14 15 (Good)	 Applicant clearly explains the existing data regarding student achievement and/or teacher and leader effectiveness over time. There are quantitative data showing some causation between the program and the outcomes. Effective grammar and sentence mechanics (spelling, capitalization, punctuation). 	
6 7 8 9 10 (Average)	 Applicant explains the existing data regarding student achievement and/or teacher and leader effectiveness over time. There are qualitative and/or anecdotal data showing some causation between the program and the outcomes. Adequate grammar and sentence mechanics (spelling, capitalization, punctuation). 	
1 2 3 4 5 (Poor)	 Applicant is unable to provide reliable data regarding student achievement and/or teacher and leader effectiveness outcomes. Ineffective grammar and sentence mechanics (spelling, capitalization, punctuation). 	
0 (Incomplete)	If applicant has not completed the section, indicate the incompleteness with a zero.	
Comments:		

	ludes a comprehensive list of organizations and/or individuals that are critical to the success of the program. Applicant discusses how it will it has established) a relationship with these organizations/individuals.	Score 10 points possible
9 10 (Excellent)	 Applicant provides a comprehensive list and description of critical stakeholders/partners, resources and/or collaborators. Applicant provides thorough details of how the stakeholders, resources and/or collaborators will play a role in the proposed Innovation Fund project. Attached letters of commitment from identified critical partners strongly support the applicant's answers. Excellent grammar and sentence mechanics (spelling, capitalization, punctuation). 	
6 7 8 (Good)	 Applicant identifies and describes critical stakeholders/partners, resources and/or collaborators. Applicant includes details of how the stakeholders/partners, resources and/or collaborators will play a role in the proposed Innovation Fund project. Attached letters of commitment from identified critical partners support the applicant's answers. Effective grammar and sentence mechanics (spelling, capitalization, punctuation). 	
3 4 5 (Average)	 Applicant identifies some critical stakeholders/partners, resources and/or collaborators. Applicant includes vague details of how the stakeholders/partners, resources and/or collaborators will play a role in the proposed Innovation Fund project. Attached letters of commitment from identified critical partners loosely support that these partners are committed to scaling the program. Adequate grammar and sentence mechanics (spelling, capitalization, punctuation). 	
1 2 (Poor)	 Applicant does not identify or identifies and minimally describes critical stakeholders/partners, resources and/or collaborators. Applicant includes minimal details of how the stakeholders/partners, resources and/or collaborators will play a role in the proposed Innovation Fund project. Attached letters of commitment from identified critical partners do not support that these partners are committed to scaling the program. Ineffective grammar and sentence mechanics (spelling, capitalization, punctuation). 	
0 (Incomplete)	If applicant has not completed the section, indicate the incompleteness with a zero.	
Comments:		

Capacity to Scale The applicant inc chosen as the gr	cludes a thorough description of its capacity to scale the program, including: who will lead/facilitate the scaling process and why they were	Score 15 points possible
13 14 15 (Excellent)	 Applicant provides strong evidence that it has the capacity to lead a grant of this nature. The grant lead(s) is/are highly qualified to lead the scaling process. Applicant thoroughly discusses the roles and responsibilities of all stakeholders who will be involved in the scaling process. Attached resumes of key personnel strongly support the applicant's answers. Excellent grammar and sentence mechanics (spelling, capitalization, punctuation). 	
9 10 11 12 (Good)	 Applicant provides evidence that it has the capacity to lead a grant of this nature. The grant lead(s) is/are qualified to lead the scaling process. Applicant discusses the roles and responsibilities of all stakeholders who will be involved in the scaling process. Attached resumes of key personnel support the applicant's answers. Effective grammar and sentence mechanics (spelling, capitalization, punctuation). 	
5 6 7 8 (Average)	 Applicant provides some evidence that it has the capacity to lead a grant of this nature. The grant lead(s) is/are somewhat qualified to lead the scaling process. Applicant discusses the role and responsibilities of most stakeholders who will be involved in the scaling process. Attached resumes of key personnel loosely indicate that the individuals listed have the capacity to scale the program. Adequate grammar and sentence mechanics (spelling, capitalization, punctuation). 	
1 2 3 4 (Poor)	 Applicant provides limited evidence that it has the capacity to lead a grant of this nature. The grant lead(s) is/are not qualified to lead the scaling process. Applicant discusses the role and responsibilities of a few stakeholders who will be involved in the scaling process. Attached resumes of key personnel do not indicate that the individuals listed have the capacity to scale the program. Ineffective grammar and sentence mechanics (spelling, capitalization, punctuation). 	
0 (Incomplete)	If applicant has not completed the section, indicate the incompleteness with a zero.	
Comments:		

Scope of Work The applicant in potential challer	cludes a chart detailing the Scope of Work required to scale the proposed program noting intended milestones, deliverables, and any nges.	Score 15 points possible
13 14 15 (Excellent)	 Applicant thoroughly describes all program activities and deliverables over the grant period. The activities described appear to align with the successful scaling of a program that will yield positive outcomes. Applicant thoroughly describes any limiting circumstances and proposed plans to mitigate those challenges. Excellent grammar and sentence mechanics (spelling, capitalization, punctuation). 	
9 10 11 12 (Good)	 Applicant describes all program activities and deliverables over the grant period. The activities described appear to align with the successful scaling of a program that will yield some positive outcomes. Applicant describes any limiting circumstances and proposed plans to mitigate those challenges. Effective grammar and sentence mechanics (spelling, capitalization, punctuation). 	
5 6 7 8 (Average)	 Applicant vaguely describes all program activities and deliverables over the grant period. The activities described appear to align with the scaling of a program that may or may not yield positive outcomes Applicant vaguely describes potential limiting circumstance and plans to mitigate those challenges. Adequate grammar and sentence mechanics (spelling, capitalization, punctuation). 	
1 2 3 4 (Poor)	 Applicant does not or minimally describes program activities and deliverables over the grant period. The activities described do not appear to align with the implementation of a program that yields positive outcomes. Applicant does not or minimally describes potential limiting circumstances and the proposed plans to mitigate those challenges. Ineffective grammar and sentence mechanics (spelling, capitalization, punctuation). 	
0 (Incomplete)	If applicant has not completed the section, indicate the incompleteness with a zero.	
Comments:		

Budget Applicant provid	les a specific budget and budget narrative with reasonable, allowable, and allocable expenses.	Score 15 points possible
13 14 15 (Excellent)	 Line items are specific, reasonable, and quantifiable. Items are directly related to the proposed Innovation Fund project (allocable) as identified within the application. Items link to the proposed Innovation Fund project and appear in other application sections. Excellent grammar and sentence mechanics (spelling, capitalization, punctuation). 	
9 10 11 12 (Good)	 Line items are mostly specific, reasonable, and quantifiable. There are a few (1-2) items that may be misaligned. Most items are directly related to the proposed Innovation Fund project as identified within the application. Most items link to the proposed Innovation Fund project and appear in other application sections. Effective grammar and sentence mechanics (spelling, capitalization, punctuation). 	
5 6 7 8 (Average)	 Line items are mostly specific, reasonable, and quantifiable. There are a few (3-4) items that may be misaligned. Items are somewhat related to the proposed Innovation Fund project as identified within the application. Items vaguely link to the proposed Innovation Fund project and somewhat appear in other application sections. Adequate grammar and sentence mechanics (spelling, capitalization, punctuation). 	
1 2 3 4 (Poor)	 Line items are not specific, reasonable, and quantifiable. Items are not related or minimally related to the proposed Innovation Fund project as identified within the application. Items do not link or minimally link to the proposed Innovation Fund project and do not appear or minimally appear in other application sections. Ineffective grammar and sentence mechanics (spelling, capitalization, punctuation). 	
0 (Incomplete)	If applicant has not completed the section, indicate the incompleteness with a zero.	
Comments:		